

**REMARKS**

Claims 11-18, 20, 21 and 25-32 have been examined. Claims 11, 12, 14-18, 21 and 25-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 13 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,655,145 to Olsen (“Olsen”)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 12, 14-18, 21 and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Olsen.

**A. Claim 11**

Claim 11 recites, “...a reference hole that is provided in an outer periphery of a surface of said cartridge case,” and “wherein said reference hole is not provided in any of said four corners of said cartridge case.”

In the July 25, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner maintained that hole 32 of Olsen corresponds to the claimed reference hole. In view of the arguments presented in the October 25, 2007 Amendment, the Examiner withdrew his assertion that hole 32 discloses the claimed reference hole, but now contends that hole 68 of Olsen discloses the claimed reference hole (pg. 4 of current Office Action). Applicant submits, however, that hole 68 of Olsen is an access opening at the center of the casing wall 28 for gaining access to the opening 70 of the hub 60 of the reel 40 (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 34-42). Since hole 68 is provided at the *center* of the casing wall 28, hole 68 is not provided along a periphery of the case and thus fails to teach or suggest the claimed reference hole.

Applicant notes that the above arguments were previously presented in the May 8, 2007 Amendment. In the July 25, 2007 Office Action, which was responsive to the May 8, 2007 Amendment, the Examiner withdrew his assertion that hole 68 of Olsen discloses the claimed reference hole. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review the arguments already presented by the Applicant regarding holes 88, 68, 70 or 32 of Olsen.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited reference.

**B. Claims 15 and 16**

Claims 15 and 16 recite subject matter analogous to claim 11, and therefore are allowable for the similar reasons claim 11 is shown to be allowable.

**C. Claims 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 25-32**

Since claims 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 25-32 depend from one of the independent claims that have been shown to be allowable, Applicant submits that such claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, claims 30-32 recite, “a second reference hole provided in said outer periphery of said surface, said second reference hole not provided in any of said four corners of said cartridge case.” Thus, the alleged second reference hole 32 of Olsen fails to disclose the claimed second reference hole since such hole is provided in a corner of the cartridge of Figure 1 thereof. Applicant submits that claims 30-32 are patentable at least this additional reason.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Olsen**

The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Olsen. Since claims 13 and 20 are dependent upon one of claims 11 and 16, Applicant submits that claims 13 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 26, 2008